

REMARKS

In the Final Office Action dated May 1, 2008, it is noted that claims 1 – 18 are pending, and that claims 1 – 18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103. Claims 1, 7, 13 and 16 are independent claims.

In the present amendment, claims 1, 7, 10, 13 and 16 have been amended to more clearly and distinctly claim the subject matter that Applicant regards as his invention. No new matter has been added.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 1 – 5, 7 – 11 and 13 – 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Gupta et al. (US 6,766,176 B1) and McIntosh (US 6,639,987 B2).

Claims 6 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Gupta et al. and McIntosh and further in view of Lowe (US 2004/0229568 A1).

Response to Arguments

Applicant submits that for at least the following reasons, claims 1 – 18 are patentable over Gupta et al., McIntosh and Lowe, alone or in combination.

For example, amended claim 1 requires:

“wherein the enhancing includes converting the incoming call to text by speech recognition and displaying the text.”

The support for the claim amendment may be found in Applicant’s specification, page 6, lines 9 – 13.

In the Office Action, page 3, it is conceded by the Office that Gupta et al. does not disclose the enhancing includes converting the incoming call to text and displaying the text. Because of this defect in Gupta et al., the Office cited McIntosh, which apparently discloses a

EXPEDITED PROCEDURE

communication device with an active equalizer. However, Applicant respectfully submits that McIntosh does not cure the above defect in Gupta et al.

McIntosh (Fig. 3 item 18, and column 3, lines 55 – 63) apparently discloses a display that displays data such as one or more communication messages, phone numbers, or caller identifications. In fact, the “Response to Arguments” section of the Office Action appears to equate applicant’s claimed feature with a type of caller ID in McIntosh.

However, McIntosh does not disclose how the incoming call is converted into text. Applicant submits that nothing in McIntosh teaches or suggests the use of speech recognition to convert an incoming call into text. Therefore, McIntosh does not disclose “*wherein the enhancing includes converting the incoming call to text by speech recognition and displaying the text,*” as claimed.

Applicant further submits that Lowe, which apparently relates to a combined advertising and entertainment system network, does not cure the above deficiencies found in Gupta et al. and McIntosh. This is because nothing in Lowe teaches or suggests the feature of “*converting the incoming call to text by speech recognition and displaying the text,*”.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant submits that claim 1 is patentable over Gupta et al., McIntosh and Lowe, alone or in combination. Claims 7, 13 and 16 should also be patentable because they contain many similar distinguishing features as in claim 1. Claims 2 – 6, 8 – 12, 14 – 15, and 17 – 18 are believed to be patentable because they respectively depend from claims 1, 7, 13 and 16, with each claim containing further distinguishing features. Withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1 – 18 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that all the claims pending in this patent application are in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and allowance of all the claims are respectfully solicited.

EXPEDITED PROCEDURE

In the event there are any errors with respect to the fees for this response or any other papers related to this response, the Director is hereby given permission to charge any shortages and credit any overcharges of any fees required for this submission to Deposit Account No. 14-1270.

Respectfully submitted,

/Brian S. Myers/

By: Brian S. Myers
Registration No.: 46,947
For: Michael Marion
Registration No.: 32,266

Please Address All Correspondence to:

Michael Marion, Registration No. 32,266

Phone: (914) 333-9641

CUSTOMER NUMBER 24737